

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Applicant acknowledges, with thanks, the receipt of the office action dated May 31, 2006, and completion of the personal interview of August 8, 2006. The discussions therein, along with the Examiner's much-appreciated observations and suggestions, are summarized and incorporated herein. In view of the comments herein, it is respectively submitted that all of the Examiner's concerns are addressed, and all claims are in condition for allowance.

Claims 18, 20-21, 25-26, 28-29, and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,931,463 to Streimer in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,842,460 to Olkkonen et al. and U.S. Patent No. 5,845,280 to Treadwell III et al. Claims 19, 22-24, 27, and 30-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Streimer in view of Olkkonen and Treadwell III and further in view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0138557 to Mukaiyama et al. For the reasons noted herein, it is submitted that all claims are patentably distinct over the art of record, and in condition for allowance thereover.

As discussed during the interview, the subject application teaches a system that commences a document processing operation only after a completed transmission of an entire document, as evidenced by transmission of an end-of-file marker. Thus, with the subject system, multiple wireless devices can efficiently share a common document processor, such as a shared printer. In a shared peripheral environment, such as a printing kiosk situated at an airport, multiple wireless device users may each send a document for printing. A large document being sent may require a lot of time to communicate. Another user may send a small document that can be sent, and printed, before the large document has been fully transmitted. Absent commencement of an operation that is triggered by an end-of-file marker, the owner of the small document would not be able to print until the entire large document was uploaded, and then processed.

The aforementioned limitations are reflected in independent claims 18 and 26. In both claims, a document processing operation is not commenced until the complete document has been transmitted, as evidenced by an end-of-file marker. No art of record teaches this limitation. Accordingly, reconsideration of the subject rejection is respectfully urged, and an allowance of all claims respectfully requested.

If there are any fees necessitated by the foregoing communication, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge such fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0902, referencing our Docket No. 66329/20690.

Respectfully submitted,



Susan J. Mizer
Registration No. 38,245
TUCKER ELLIS & WEST LLP
1150 Huntington Bldg.
925 Euclid Ave.
Cleveland, Ohio 44115-1414
Customer No.: 23380
Tel.: (216) 696-3466
Fax: (216) 592-5009

Date: August 15, 2006